

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 1-32 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 4, 13, 16, 20, 24, and 25 are sought to be amended. Claims 31-32 are sought to be added. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,584,505 to Howard *et al.* (hereinafter "Howard"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

With regards to independent claims 1, 13, 24, and 25, Howard does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Howard does not

teach or suggest Applicants' claimed elements of: creating a user password cookie using a shared secret key; and transmitting the user password cookie in response to the request to connect.

To the contrary, Howard teaches authenticating access to a network server *without* communicating login information through the network server. See *Howard*, Title, Abstract. Howard teaches using an authentication server to authenticate each login using the associated password. *Howard*, col. 2, lines 24-25. With Howard, the individual web server that a user is trying to access is not required to authenticate the user and does not receive the user's password. *Howard*, col. 2, lines 25-28. Thus, unlike the present invention, Howard does not teach or suggest that the web server that a user is trying to access creates a user password cookie (which includes the user's login ID and password) using a shared secret key or transmits the user password cookie in response to the request to connect because Howard does not enable the web server to receive the user's password.

With respect to Applicants' independent claim 23, Howard does not teach or suggest Applicants' data structure representing a password cookie comprising the elements of: a user identification (ID); a password; and a time stamp associated with said user ID and password, wherein said password cookie is encrypted using a shared secret key.

Unlike the present invention, Howard does not teach or suggest a password cookie or encrypting the password cookie using a shared secret key. To the contrary, Howard teaches that cookies written by an affiliate server are encrypted using a key that is unique to the affiliate server. As indicated above, the affiliate server (referred to above

as the web server that a user is trying to access) does not receive the user's password, and therefore, cannot create a password cookie using a shared key.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 2-12, 14-22, 31, 32, and 26-30, respectively) are not anticipated by Howard. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 23, 24, and 25, and the claims that depend therefrom respectively.

#### ***New Claims***

New claims 31 and 32 have been added. Claims 31 and 32 depend from independent claims 23 and 24, respectively, and thus, are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reasons stated above.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

*Crystal D. Sayles*

Crystal D. Sayles  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
Registration No. 44,318  
(703) 633-6829

Dated: April 22, 2004

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

4.22.04  
Date of Deposit  
Devel S. Watson  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence  
[Signature] 4.22.04  
Signature Date